

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: [inaudible] meeting [inaudible] I'm only on the phone. I'll be on it [inaudible] shortly. But I think my power will be fixed. If – who all is just on the phone, besides me – and, I guess, Laureen, that's not in Adobe Connect? Anyone else?

MARGIE MILAM: Jonathan, it's Margie Milam. I'm not Adobe Connect, I don't think.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. Are there any updated Statements of Interest? I'll raise my hand and say that I've updated my Statement of Interest to reflect my new position at Innovators Network, so if you need some exciting reading, go ahead and go over and read that. And other than that, why don't we just get started with the agenda. Jean-Baptiste, why don't I hand it back to you, since I don't have that in front of me?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Okay, sure. So, we will start today with a document from the public comment period, starting with an update on the different comment for every [inaudible] to date. So I've prepared for you a document with the only two comments we have received so far, so we'll – I think that you cannot look at it and zoom on your computer – so, we have received two comments. First one was on the 19<sup>th</sup> of March from [inaudible], who is making, essentially, a comment on the draft report, but more a remark on .ORG and how making it available to [inaudible] organization will improve consumer trust. And the second one is – was made on the

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

12<sup>th</sup> of April from [inaudible], from a new gTLD registry, [inaudible], which is for the [inaudible] community to – kind of a geographical [inaudible]. And again, it's so much a comment on the draft report, but it's much a comment on how they deal with DNS abuse with their registrants and how they use consumer trust as a [inaudible] point for their TLD.

So, that's the main two comments we have received so far. Are there any questions on that?

Okay. And so, [inaudible] thing [inaudible] wants to [inaudible] that we have received last week from the GAC a request to extend the deadline of the public comment period, so just [inaudible] yet. And, since we're discussing today during this call – if you agree with the time I am proposed – so – ?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Ah, yes. So, we got a request from the GAC to extend the public comment period so that they have an opportunity to give a full-fledged comment. And this is somewhat anticipated, because requests for extensions from the GNSO and the GAC are pretty common. It makes it difficult for us to assess the level of comments, because comments come in at the last minute, regardless of what the deadline is, and so, part of me would like to secretly extend the deadline to the GAC [inaudible] rather than making it public, because it'll just put it on everybody's back burner again. But we did anticipate it, which is why we didn't go forward with the face-to-face in Barcelona, because we anticipated not having enough public comments to go over it without an

---

extension. So, I think we're okay with our current schedule to extend the public comment period. And there's been a suggestion – extend it to May 31. Jordyn had some ideas about trying to do it a week – you know, cutting it off a week earlier. Jordyn, I don't know if you want to speak to that – or Laureen, if you have any insights into what's the GACer up to?

[CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That's okay; sorry. So, my sense was that the GAC was considering commenting, but when they realized that the report is so long, and also covers a variety of issues, that led to a realization – at least, by the folks that suggested it; and I think that this came from a suggestion about the GAC commenting came from the European Union, from Megan's colleague, Cristina Monti – there was a recognition that it might be difficult for the GAC, as a whole, to have one unified comment when the report covers so many different separate issues, and it might be better to give a little more time so that individual countries have an opportunity, if they wish, to file more tailored comments. That's my understanding of the reasoning behind it. So, they need more of an opportunity to digest if they're going to go through that process. And it may be that the GAC comes up with some sort of general statement. But they wanted to give the individual countries an opportunity to really delve into the report.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   Laureen, what is the degree to which the GAC could break things up, so that the issues that were specific to the GAC – I mean, could the GAC file different comments with different levels of consensus, or something like that? Because it would – the things that are specific to the GAC, it would probably be good to get consensus – comments to the extent that such a [inaudible] exists.

LAUREEN KAPIN:                   I think that they could – they certainly could say, “On these three issues, the GAC appreciates the work of the committee and endorses the recommendation.” What I don’t think they would do is have – file comments with different levels of consensus. I think they would seek to file a single comment where they achieved consensus, and then leave it to individual countries to file among themselves. The GAC usually doesn’t like to take positions that they haven’t achieved consensus on, although that’s a continual subject of debate, and who knows if it could change? But that’s my reading of it.

JONATHAN ZUCK:                   Yeah, no, I know they didn’t want to do that; I just was operating under the assumption that anything that was – covered the entire report in which they achieved consensus would be absurdly superficial. That’s why I wanted to –

LAUREEN KAPIN:                   Exactly.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: – put down in such a way that there was consensus on some portion of the recommendations that would directly apply to the GAC, for example, that’s all that –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Yes, I think that they certainly could do that.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Anyway – Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Yeah, so just a bit [inaudible], I think it’s reasonable to give the GAC an extension, as they’ve requested. I think their input would be helpful. I think that the original email requested an extension till at least mid-May; preferably till the end of May. Looking at the timeline that the Staff had proposed with regards to an extension till the end of May, we would end up with the summary of public comments right, right before our potential face-to-face in Joburg, which I guess we’ll talk about in a minute. And I guess I was just hoping to give us a little bit more space to digest and discuss leading up to the meeting, so perhaps sort of splitting the difference between the GAC’s two requested dates and doing it between the mid-month and the end of the month – like the 24<sup>th</sup>, or something like that – so that we’d have an extra week leading into the face-to-face to digest the comments and the Staff report.

LAUREEN KAPIN: And, you know, I’m going to chime in –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hey, Jordyn –

LAUREEN KAPIN: – and agree with Jordyn, but I would say, if they’ve said mid-May to the end of May, I would think that if they said mid-May was okay, do mid-May and allow the extra time.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I mean, in an ideal world, you know, the public comment breakdown isn’t [inaudible] thing, but something that would happen incrementally. But as we discussed, whatever deadline we set, the week before is when we’re going to be getting most of our comments, probably. So, I guess I’m inclined to agree with Lauren – that if the GAC’s okay with mid-May, then maybe we should cut it off then, so that it induces others to compile their comments, as well as the GAC. But I welcome discussion from other people.

If you’re typing in the chat, I can’t hear that.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: So far, Jonathan, there is no communication in the chat. Carlton is writing, and there are no hands raised.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Although it appears that Carlton is typing.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: So, maybe – May 15<sup>th</sup> is a Monday, so one possibility to give folks a little bit more time would be to extend to, like, a little bit later that week; either the 17<sup>th</sup> or the 19<sup>th</sup>. I don't know what "mid-May" means. Presumably, the 15<sup>th</sup>, but, you know – somewhere in there, to make it so that it doesn't land the first day of the week might be good, but otherwise, I agree. The more time we have, the better to digest things.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, so are we on track for the 19<sup>th</sup>? Does anybody object to that as an extension date?

And then, I guess my question for Staff is, procedurally, is this just an announcement on our part [inaudible], or do we formally respond to the GAC in particular [inaudible]?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: [inaudible], we'd need to put a rationale on the public comment page, explaining why we are extending the public comment period, and we'd also have to send a response to the GAC.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. I'll work on that with you guys separately, then.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes. That's correct.

---

MARGIE MILAM: Jonathan, it's Margie –

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, [CROSSTALK]

MARGIE MILAM: Sorry.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes, go ahead.

MARGIE MILAM: I know from the Staff perspective, we're going through this internal process to get [inaudible], Compliance, and GSE input, so the different departments that are touched on with recommendations; and I just note that, because of all of the activity going on for the next few weeks, it's going to be hard for us to meet that date. We wanted to be able to submit it during public comment so that the rest of the folks could see it. It's a little more visible that way. So, we, personally, were hoping for May 31, and that way, we could have our collective Staff input.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Well, I mean, you know that you guys get a special pass, anyway. So, it's more that you want – you think it'll have more community visibility if it's within the public comment period?



---

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, and there's certainly other ways to do that. I mean, that's certainly true. So – but sometimes, it's just better – we prefer – you know, if we can do it that way, but if you all prefer your earlier date, that's fine. We'll just keep on our process to get you the comments so that you have a comprehensive view from the Staff on those.

[CROSSTALK]

JORDYN BUCHANAN: It's Jordyn. I agree with Jonathan – go ahead, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Go ahead, Jordyn.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I was just going to say, I agree that it would be good – like, the Staff can submit – yeah, there are various ways we [inaudible] Staff [inaudible] from the broader community. And Jonathan made the point earlier that, whatever date this is, we're going to get most of our comments within a week of whatever date we set. And so, just from the ability to process the bulk of non-ICANN organization comments, it would be good to set the date as early as we think we're going to be able to get those comments in, and not sort of [inaudible] that on the Staff comments.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: So, we can live with that, Margie?

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, that's fine.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay, great. You raised a good point, though, because one of the things that I know we want to do is get some greater specificity to the recommendations specifically aimed at compliance, in order to get more specific feedback on them. It's from the data sets that we're trying to collect, and things like that. Jamie, are you on the – is Jamie on the call?

JAMIE HEDLUND: I am.

JONATHAN ZUCK: What's the best way for us to handle that? Is that a meeting with you, here in D.C.? Is it coming out to L.A. and meeting with more of the Staff? Is it a conference call? What's the best way to go about grinding through that process so that you feel best equipped to respond as you can be?

JAMIE HEDLLUND: So, I'll have a better handle on exactly how to get together on that when we finish our analysis, which we're almost done with, of the draft recommendations as they exist now. And so, depending on what those

---

look like, a call might be sufficient; an in-person meeting might make more sense; where we have it, I guess, would depend on the makeup of the meeting. Obviously, more ICANN folks are in L.A., but if it's one person from Compliance and one person – and I'm making this up – one person from IT, they could easily come to D.C., as well. So, can I get back to you on that as soon as we're finished with our analysis?

JONATHAN ZUCK:

For sure. I mean, you and I have gone sort of back and forth on what constitutes refinement of recommendations, versus what constitutes implementation advice, etcetera, and so I didn't know where that line was; and so, I just wanted to make sure that you got the specificity you needed from us in your process of evaluating the recommendations. That's what I thought the issue was.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Yeah, no, I think that is the issue. I'm – in a way, though, I'm not sure that the line is ultimately that important – or as important as getting an understanding or alignment on what the recommendation really means, and what it could look like in implementation. Because we've brought in the past another context, where we thought we understood what the recommendation meant, we ran – and this is not Compliance – we ran forward with an implementation, and others giving the advice were not necessarily happy with our understanding. So, I'd like to avoid that as much as possible, which would require both talking about the recommendation, itself, and implementation. At least, at a high level. I don't want to be in the position where we've implemented something

---

and it's a 180-degree difference from what was intended. Does that make sense? I'm speaking as ICANN Staffer, not as a member of the Review Team.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

No, of course. And as I'm speaking to you. I just – remember that one of the things that we're doing differently is some set of the Review Team is going to remain engaged as part of implementation, specifically to prevent the scenario that you outlined. So, it's really just a question of, what level of clarification do we need at the recommendation phase, rather than direct participation by Laureen and Drew and others in the implementation phase, designed to prevent misunderstanding there. So, give that some thought. Because [inaudible] going away, I guess, in this case; and that's the part that's different from the past.

JAMIE HEDLUND:

Yeah, no, I understood, and I just want to avoid – to the extent that we can – avoid disconnects during the actual implementation by having a wholesome discussion of the recommendation and what an implementation would look like. I don't mean flow charts and timelines and expenditure detail, just – “This is what we think you mean, and this is how – if left on our own, this is how we would do it.” You know, that those two things are – that there's alignment between the Review Team and Staff. And that we would also point out any challenges that we might be – as a result of [inaudible], itself – you know, I'm just making this up, like you. If it says, you need to [inaudible] – you need to start tracking – or you need to start suspending, or requiring suspension of

---

domain names because of spam, we would – we and hopefully others by the [inaudible] would say, “Well, that doesn’t even make sense [inaudible] implementation, but the recommendation level, there is a problem there, or a potential problem of what the scope of – whether or not that falls within the scope of ICANN’s mission. So, [CROSSTALK] The more robust discussion I have, the better.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Well, I’ll let you get back to us, then, about how best we can go about giving you the guidance that you want.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Okay. [inaudible]

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Jonathan, there were a few comments from a couple of people while you were talking. So, the first one is [CROSSTALK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jean-Baptiste, can you manage the queue?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Just wanted to read out loud some of the comments from Carlton in the chat room, while you were talking. The first one was on the GAC discussion. So, he says, “The value of the GAC statements would make is impossible [inaudible] give them through the 19<sup>th</sup>. Don’t [inaudible] nature of the extension.” And the second comment he had

---

to you, Jonathan, was “The first requirement is for an agreement on the data set, itself. The ALAC is already fretting that activity surrounding the DNS [inaudible] may be doing work on the data sets we are predicting already.”

JONATHAN ZUCK: I’m sorry, can you read that one again?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure. “The first requirement is for an agreement on the data set, itself. The ALAC is already fretting that activity surrounding the DNS [inaudible] may be doing work on the data sets we are predicting already.”

JONATHAN ZUCK: Ah, yes. That’s right. I mean, there’s a bunch of requests for data, essentially, from Compliance, and I think that’s the core of our requirements, and also part of the Health Index [inaudible], as well. So, I’m sure Jamie’s going to [inaudible] this from a couple of different sides, and we’ll do our best to kind of coordinate them.

JAMIE HEDLUND: Yeah, as a general proposition, I would think more data is better.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, you won’t get any disagreement there, so – but maybe we can think that out in some detail, in terms of – historically, people have

---

been most frustrated by not having the simplicity of complaints, the simplicity of resolution, timing of resolution, and things like that that are categories of data that you'd want to be able to record and therefore set metrics for improvement.

JAMIE HEDLUND: I just wanted to start off the meeting with a controversial comment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Jean-Baptiste, do you want to move on to the overview of where things are with the face-to-face? For Alice?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Sure, I will let – Alice is not in the room – I will let Margie mention the subject on updates on ICANN 59.

MARGIE MILAM: Sure. Hi, everyone. So, I don't really have good news right now. We've been working really hard with the Meetings Team to understand what the parameters are, and what is possible and not possible during the Johannesburg. And as some of the emails that you've seen show, a lot of the agenda is driven by – most of the agenda is driven by the leadership of the SO/ACs, and there are folks there that do not want Review Teams meeting before or after ICANN meetings, because they feel that – at least, what I've heard; the feedback I've heard is that if people plan to go out there for a specific number of days, then they're not able to provide feedback if Review Teams are meeting two days

---

before, because they're not able to attend those meetings, those sessions. And so, internally, we're trying to understand what our options are. Because we understand that, obviously, we have to support Review Teams, and we have budgeted and planned for Review Teams to meet. This is not specific to CCC, but it's across – you know, I have the same issue with the SSR team, as an example. And in particular, with you guys, with the CCT, it's much more important because you've got your draft report, and that's a point that I've been [inaudible] with my executive – that we've got [inaudible] where we need to be able to get feedback, and the other issue is that the themes for Johannesburg – at least, the ones I've seen that the SO/AC leadership wants to focus on is the new gTLDs. So, obviously, CCT is irrelevant there. And the second topic that they prefer for Johannesburg is WHOIS [inaudible]. So, that, for me, is [inaudible]. So, what I'm expecting is, over the next few days [inaudible] from [inaudible] is that [inaudible] other [inaudible] like [inaudible] your team, can meet in Johannesburg. And until that, I believe that I should [inaudible] by early [inaudible]. Because what I pointed out to them was, we don't get this resolved, we're going to run into a lot of [inaudible], which makes it harder to plan, and so [inaudible] location if it's not possible to have it at the [inaudible]. So, that [inaudible] next week, I can have a [inaudible] on whether we can meet and where, whether it's before Johannesburg or during Johannesburg, since they're not going to allow meetings before or after. But that's unfortunately the [inaudible] we're facing right now.



---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Okay. Yeah, so you're saying it's not the Meetings Team, it's actually SO/AC leadership that are opposed to us meeting beforehand.

MARGIE MILAM: Yes, because remember the new meeting strategy, that the agenda is to be set by then. So, it's an entirely different format than what we do for the other meetings. And so, that's the problem that we're facing right now, is that, do we – what do we do in the face of that? And also, realizing that ICANN as an organization is committed to [inaudible] reviews, and part of the review process, which is the theme I've been sharing out, so I'm back to my Meetings Team with is, we have to get community consultation. That is a big part of what is happening, in particular, a high priority of the CCT, of all my Review Teams, because of the fact that that your draft report is out there. So, they understand – I mean, the Meetings Team understands; they're just in this box. They're trying to determine what's the best path forward – whether they can try to identify a space before Johannesburg, is that a politically reasonable approach? Or, perhaps, scheduling the CCT during the four days – and not in, like, two-day blocks, but perhaps around the sessions that are going on. Because of what happens in this particular forum, in the Policy forum, is that there are several non-conflicted – I mean, several blocks of time that can't have conflicts. That's the idea behind the Policy forum, is that you get everybody together to talk about whatever the issues are that the community leaders think are important. And so, what that does is, unlike other ICANN meetings where you can have dozens of meetings going on at the same time, there are large blocks of time that can't have any conflicting sessions. So, that's my kind of back-up: is it possible to have CCT meet in 2-hour, 90-minute blocks where

---

available? And I don't have an answer for that right now. But like I said, they – I've put the issue to them; they understand the pressure, they understand the logic, and I told them we need an answer, because we have to be able to plan. So, I have a commitment that I should have an answer by early next week.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Margie. And I guess what I'm trying to get at is, are they the ones that need [inaudible] to provide the answer, or do we need to be speaking to someone amorphous SO/AC leadership, too? Because somehow, this is managed for the CCWG, for Work Stream 2; and so, I wonder if it's a question of trying to make our case elsewhere. Because I [CROSSTALK] between a rock and a hard place.

MARGIE MILAM:

Exactly, and that's not a bad plan. Because if you go to James on the GNSO side and Carlton and Carlos go to ALAC, and Laureen goes to, you know – each of you go to your leaders and say, "Look, this is really important. We need to be able to have consultations on this draft report in Johannesburg," then that – you know, may help break through the log jam we're in right now. Because that's the problem we're having.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Okay. I'm certainly happy to reach out to James. Carlton, can you reach out to Alan, I guess; and Laureen, can you reach out to GAC about this issue so that three emails get generated, basically?

LAUREEN KAPIN: I don't think the GAC – honestly, I don't think the GAC has any news on this. I don't think they care whether we meet or not. And Margie, actually, I'm still a little confused as to what the concern is here, and I'm sorry if I'm being a little slow, but can you articulate the concern again? Because I still don't understand it.

MARGIE MILAM: Yeah, so in the Policy meeting – we adopted a new meeting strategy about a year ago –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right. Right.

MARGIE MILAM: – and in this new meeting strategy, where this meeting's supposed to focus on policy issues, it's all focused on policy. And so, the agenda is set by the SO/AC leaders. And they have complained and asserted that they do not want any meetings before or after, except for the ones that they approve, and they approved the CCWG, or whatever – the Work Stream 2 folks for the day before, and so –

LAUREEN KAPIN: Right, but why –

---

MARGIE MILAM: No, no, no; let me stop.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Why don't they want any meetings before or after? That's the part I don't understand.

MARGIE MILAM: Because they would – they feel like since the dates have already been set for Johannesburg, that people have already made their plans, and now they haven't planned to come in two days earlier to be able to attend the CC – you know, you guys' CCT meeting – to participate in the discussions. That's the concern, that they [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN: Oh. [CROSSTALK]

JAMIE HEDLUND: Laureen, maybe I can help. I had to deal with this directly with a former Board member who tried to have a meeting before the last meeting, or during the last meeting, and the request for his group to meet was rejected because of this new meeting strategy, which is pretty strict about a couple of things. Number one, if there is a set meeting time, then to have meetings on either side, the beginning or the end, risks undermining participation and inclusivity by having a time when people would otherwise attend or listen in, but can't, because they're traveling. And similarly, if there's a request – and this goes for anyone – that's not particularly [inaudible] Policy meeting, but for all the meetings – if

---

there's a request to hold a meeting, during [inaudible] has to be sponsored by [inaudible] SO/AC [inaudible] has to be [inaudible] during their scheduled time [CROSSTALK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Why don't you – your microphone's on.

JAMIE HEDLUND: The problem we face is that we get several requests for meetings that are outside the boundaries of a normal ICANN meeting. And so, how do you come up with a way of selecting some, but not all, and saying some are sufficiently related, and others aren't? And that none of them is of so much interest to a large portion of the community that to have them at a time when [inaudible] can deprive adequate participation? That is the backdrop. There's been a lot of thought and time put into this, and it's – you know, we just have a finite amount of time, we have a policy that was set by the community and that has the effect that it does on meetings like ours.

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, that's very helpful, Jamie. [inaudible]

JAMIE HEDLUND: You're breaking up.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Laureen, it seems we lost you.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Laureen, did we lose you? It sounds like we did. Jordyn, go ahead.

Jordyn, do we still have you?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: That's weird. Do you hear me now?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We do.

JORDYN BUCHANAN: I don't know why I was magically muted, but in any case, I was going to make two observations. The first is that the two sets of imperatives – I mean, it doesn't really matter, to a certain extent, why the SO/AC leadership believes what it does, unless we can convince them otherwise, because clearly, the meeting strategy has been driving the agenda, there. Having said that, the two imperatives that Jamie outlined sort of contradict each other. If they don't want to have meetings during the actual days of the ICANN session that aren't sort of core to those meetings, it seems strange that they also don't allow people to avail themselves of the opportunity to meet adjacent, to organize work, for example, like we would; in addition to doing some engagement that would be relevant to a formal agenda. But, I was going to say, unless we're successful with entreaties to the leadership, it likely doesn't matter.

---

The second thing I'll say – and here, I'll note I'm a little conflicted, because I don't think I can [inaudible] before Monday. So, I'm channeling a little bit of my own self-interest here, but I think it would be helpful for us to think about what we would like to get out of our time in Joburg before we think too much about which strategy is right, and I think our strategies include trying to push this time immediately before, accepting the proposition – only [inaudible] has been [inaudible] figure out some set of meetings during the week, if that's even acceptable; or third, setting a face-to-face at a different time and venue. And in particular, do we expect that we need public engagement as part of that process? Because, as Margie pointed out, to the extent that we need public engagement – and obviously, we have to do it in Johannesburg. We have to figure out how to attach it to that. It also makes sense that public engagement [CROSSTALK]

LAUREEN KAPIN:

Sorry, I –

JORDYN BUCHANAN:

– would happen as part of the ICANN Week. So I tried to think about this a little bit over the weekend, and one of the things that we absolutely need to do is have discussions around the DNS abuse study. Hopefully, that's [inaudible] to the gTLD track that's expected to be discussed at the meeting. But that's something that's – we could conceivably make sense of during the week. We could have a working session that involves us trying to understand – talk about the report in our findings, along with the community. The format of the Policy forum

---

is supposed to be that we get everyone together in a room and work through issues, so to a certain extent, maybe, the DNS abuse discussion happens in that manner, with Review Team members participating, and then tack on a little bit of time, as Margie suggested, sort of adjacent to that, or in some of the slots in between.

Our other big task is to digest public comments. So, I guess the question is, to what extent does that need to happen in and around Johannesburg? Could we do it in the cracks, could we do it beforehand? And, you know, I just want to think through what we need the time for, and how compatible it is with the notion of trying to interweave it with work during the week.

JONATHAN ZUCK: I've got some thoughts there, but Laureen, I wanted to let you finish the thoughts that you had started before we lost you. [inaudible]

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, what I'm hearing is that, for certain issues, we definitely want to be mindful of the participation of the greater community and we'll try and schedule those slots during the meeting, or perhaps for the activities that center around assessment of the public comments. That could be done in some other way. Is that the gist of the approach you were suggesting, Jordyn?

JORDYN BUCHANAN: Sort of. I mean, I'm mostly just saying, let's think through why we want to meet and then figure out how compatible with each of those



---

purposes are various times – like even before, during, or elsewhere, relative to Johannesburg.

LAUREEN KAPIN:

That's what I was thinking about in response to Jamie's comment, which is, this is really a meaningful participation concern, that we don't want people to miss out if they want to join in our Review Team's current activity, and that makes sense for me in terms of the new data topics, for example, the DNS abuse, if we have new [inaudible] information, or whatever new findings we're dealing with. That makes sense to me. But if it's just the analysis of the public comments, then it seems to me that perhaps that is something that there wouldn't be as much interest in participation. And that does seem more appropriate, in my mind, at least, as something that could be done on the margin of the meetings or at some other time.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Thanks, Laureen. I think part of Jamie's point is that a face-to-face might not be the most efficient way to handle public comments, either. And so, I think the question is, what would we most want to spend the time on, face-to-face? And I think it's probably about reaching consensus on what to do about the report, given the results back from the two studies and from the public comments. And so, I wonder if a hybrid approach that says that the public sessions for the DNS abuse study and the [inaudible] study that are during the meeting, and then there's potentially, you know, a day before for us to get our ducks in a row and figure out where we are in terms of public comments, in terms

---

of the changes that we'll make. I mean, I'm happy to have a more efficient face-to-face process combined with some sessions during the meeting, if that makes sense and kind of meets everybody's objectives. Kaili, are you hearing well enough to make a comment, or – ?

I saw your hand up, so I don't know whether or not you're trying to speak or not. And Pamela, [inaudible] him, and [inaudible]?

KAILI KAN: Hello? Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, we can hear you now. Thanks.

We can hear you.

KAILI KAN: Hello? [inaudible] Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can hear you.

KAILI KAN: Hello? Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: We can hear you.

KAILI KAN: Yes. [inaudible]? [inaudible], hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

KAILI KAN: Hello. Hello?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes.

KAILI KAN: Can you hear me?

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yes. Yes. Yes.

KAILI KAN: [inaudible] Great. [inaudible] I think that [inaudible] about the [inaudible]. Yeah, [inaudible] I think that [inaudible] use that support [inaudible] talk face-to-face [inaudible] go online, just like [inaudible], so I think also [inaudible] would be a good idea, and then [inaudible]. Thank you.

---

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Kaili. Eleeza?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Thank you, Jonathan. It's Eleeza. I want to make two points. One, I think someone was mentioning the discussion around gTLDs [inaudible] meetings, so I know that the [inaudible] raised this in Copenhagen – they're planning a pretty long session; I think it's a half-day session – to discuss geographic names, where they're hoping to really hammer out agreement among all TLDs on how they want to move forward on geographic names in the future. So, that's one sizeable discussion that's going to be happening during the Policy forum. The other thing I wanted to mention [inaudible] survey – I actually just heard from Laurie Schulman this morning – she will be presenting the bulk of the survey, and she will be on your May 3 call two weeks from today – I think it's two weeks from today. So, you will have those results sooner than Johannesburg, and could use some of your Plenary calls leading up to that to discuss that and come to [inaudible] conclusion.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Eleeza. And so, we may not need to have an update on the [inaudible] that's just for us. We may be able to schedule a session that's public, and maybe the [inaudible] survey. If we can get a preview of it before Johannesburg, then we can understand what's in it, so that we can in a face-to-face spend a little bit of time talking about the implications for the final draft.

---

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

I think that would be reasonable on the DNS abuse survey.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Just speaking to your individual interests, would you be able to make it the day before?

JAMIE HEDLUND:

I don't think so; I'll look at flights again. I may be able to dial in, but then I don't know if I could get there by Monday. There's a little conflict between travel timing and – I don't know. Let me try and investigate a little bit more.

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Alright. Because maybe we can implement this hybrid solution if we can get it past the Meetings Team, and serve both objectives.

Okay. So, I think we have our marching orders, in terms of reaching out to the SO/AC leadership. We're going to hear back from the Meetings Team in terms of their attempt to reconcile this, and we're going to look at the possibility of getting some things on the main schedule to take the place of face-to-face – what would otherwise be face-to-face time – and consume some stuff in public, and perhaps try to do something just one day, perhaps a face-to-face with just the team. Any other comments on this topic, before we move on to the Work Plan?

Okay. Jean-Baptiste, do you want to cover the Work Plan?

---

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yes, and I will go quickly, since we have five minutes. So, while we have just agreed on having the public comment period extended to May 19 – sorry, to – that’s not the – I have updated the Work Plan I prepared before with the new deadline. Just let me check.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, the 19<sup>th</sup>. It’s down there, at the bottom of the screen.

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: Yeah. Okay, that’s great. So, [inaudible] right now on the Work Plan, taking into account how [inaudible] impact the rest. So, as [inaudible] mentioned, on May 3, we had confirmation that we can have presentation of the [inaudible] survey results. So, our plan is to have each a Plenary call of our review of the different public comments that were received, so this would be included in the agenda of the Plenary call. So, there is a [inaudible] of getting – so, GNS review study, a preliminary report, so we’ll receive some more information on that. But there is a [inaudible] in May, and we’re expecting information [inaudible] whether it will be a preliminary report, or just a final.

So, on the 19<sup>th</sup> of May, we have the close date of the public comment period. We are also expecting the [inaudible] input on the [inaudible] recommendation. And so, having the close date of the public comment period would mean that at the latest, by the 19<sup>th</sup> of June 2017, we would have the publication of the report of public comments, and so for that, we’ll be using [inaudible] report each public comment towards the different recommendations from our report.

---

So, as Jordyn also mentioned, we still have a date to be determined based on what we just discussed now, with the different topics that were raised by Jordyn [inaudible] of the [inaudible] study, and [inaudible] review of public comments that were received. And other than that, [inaudible] Work Plan, we have the deadline as well to receive some comments on the draft final report, and I will [inaudible] it when we should send out the report – the draft final report for public comment. So, I have also saved this Work Plan on the wiki, so if you wish to have a look and share your comments, please let me know. And that's [inaudible]. Would you have any questions on that?

So, Jonathan [CROSSTALK]

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright. Thanks, Jean-Baptiste. Does anybody else have something that they need to raise?

JEAN-BAPTISTE DEROULEZ: I have something to raise, Jonathan. It's regarding the paper that [inaudible] worked on, and that was [inaudible] by Eleeza [inaudible] the 31<sup>st</sup> of March, we put the link to the Google Doc, as well. For those who like to comment, just a reminder that if you have any comments, if you could reply [inaudible] forwarding the email to the Review Team, and I am pasting the link right now in the chat.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Perfect. Thanks [inaudible]. Please take a look at this document on regional analysis and provide some feedback, please.

---

Okay. Anything else? Any other business?

LAUREEN KAPIN: So, just a recap – are we going to get some sort of summary of our approach to this reading circulated? Because I admit, I’m still a little confused.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah, I’ll send something around.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Perfect.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Alright, thanks, folks.

LAUREEN KAPIN: Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**